



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/751,016	12/27/2000	Yehuda Feuerstein	MS1-722US	6189
22801	7590	01/31/2005	EXAMINER	
LEE & HAYES PLLC 421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500 SPOKANE, WA 99201			CHAI, LONGBIT	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2131	

DATE MAILED: 01/31/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/751,016	FEUERSTEIN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Longbit Chai	2131	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 September 2004.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-32 and 37-70 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-32 and 37-70 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 27 December 2000 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____. |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1 – 75 have been presented for examination. Claims 33 – 36 and 71 – 75 have been canceled; claims 20 – 25, 27, 29, 37, 39, 41, 61 and 64 have been amended; in an amendment filed 9/10/2004. Claims 1 – 32 and 37 – 70 have been examined.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to the subject matter of the instant pending claims have been fully considered but are not persuasive.

3. As per claim 1, Applicant remarks "Farber do not describe formulating a descriptor corresponding to the replica resource and comparing the formulated descriptor with the cached descriptor", and then if the formulated descriptor and the cached descriptor are not equivalent, formulating a second descriptor corresponding to the original resource and comparing the formulated descriptor with the second descriptor". Examiner notes (a) Farber discloses providing Verify True File mechanism to verify that the data item in a True File registry is indeed the correct "data item" given its "True Name" (Farber: *inter alia*, Column 31 Line 26 – 33), (b) Farber defines a True Name is computed using a function, MD (Message Digest – equivalent to CRC), to guarantee representing the data block and only data block (Farber: *inter alia*, Column 12 Line 38 – 43). Therefore, the "True Name" is qualified as a "Descriptor". (c) Farber also discloses the system caches "data items" (i.e. True Name // Descriptor), so that only the most recently accessed data items need to be retained (Farber: *inter alia*, Column 3 Line 56 – 57). (d) Farber disclose data items (i.e. True Name // Descriptor)

can be verified and have their integrity check to ensure that they match the stored True Names and any change in a True Name potentially signals corruption in the system and can be further investigated (Farber: *inter alia*, Column 34 Line 45 – 55). (e) Farber further discloses if an error is found (i.e. the file is corrupted), the system "has the ability to heal itself by finding another source for the True File with the given name (Farber: *inter alia*, Column 31 Line 31 – 33: This must require formulating a second descriptor (i.e. second True Name // Descriptor) corresponding to the original resource (i.e. another source that holds the original true file) so that the validation of original uncorrupted file can be conducted). Therefore, Farber indeed teaches formulating a descriptor corresponding to the replica resource and comparing the formulated descriptor with the cached descriptor (i.e. True Name of Farber's)", and then if the formulated descriptor and the cached descriptor are not equivalent, formulating a second descriptor corresponding to the original resource and comparing the formulated descriptor with the second descriptor" (i.e. (d) & (e) as addressed above).

4. As per claim 20, Applicant asserts "Farber does not disclose a security component in a computing device remote to the network server (newly added in the amendment) and registerable with the server component during run-time". Examiner notes Farber discloses a Remote Mechanism to enable the capabilities of the present invention in a peer-to-peer network mode of operation to access the True File registry through the Remote Procedure Call (RPC) style interface running over many available / existing protocols" (Farber: *inter alia*, Column 23 Line 14 – 44). The RPC (Remote

Procedure Call) is inherently assured that the client must be registered with the server system during the run-time first before the further communications can really start.

5. As per claim 14, Applicant remarks "Brothers does not describe a security component that is registerable with the server component during run-time to determine whether a request will pose a security risk". Examiner notes "a security risk" is interpreted as "permit an unauthorized access to the resource". Therefore, Brother discloses validating the request for resource is authorized or not (Brother: *inter alia*, Figure 8 Element S11 and Paragraph [0109] Line 10 – 27) can indeed meet the claim language. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. Furthermore, a process / task (security component) is inherently registered with the RTOS (Real Time Operating System) in a multi-tasking operating environment when the respective process / task is invoked / initiated during the run-time after system powers up.

6. As per claim 17 and 19, Applicant remarks "Brothers does not disclose determining if a total number of characters defining all of the arguments do not exceed a maximum number of characters". Examiner notes the maximum number of characters herein is interpreted as the total number of characters aggregated from the maximum number of characters at each individual field. Therefore, the proper format checking of each individual arguments do not exceed a maximum number of characters (Brother: *inter alia*, Paragraph [0170]) is inherently validating and assuring a total number of characters defining all of the arguments do not exceed a maximum number of

characters. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claim 1 – 8, 20 – 24, and 45 – 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Farber (Patent Number: US 6415280 B1), hereinafter referred to as Farber.

8. As per claim 1, Farber discloses a network system comprising:
a. a first device to maintain an original resource (Farber: *inter alia*, Column 43 Line 59 – 61);
b. a second device to maintain a replica resource remotely from the first device, the replica resource being replicated from the original resource (Farber: *inter alia*, Column 43 Line 59 – 61);
c. memory to store a cached descriptor corresponding to the original resource (Farber: *inter alia*, Column 12 Line 38 – 43, Column 3 Line 56 – 57, Column 39 Line 24

– 25 and Figure 1(b): Applicant defines a Descriptor can be a hash function of the resource, a calculated checksum (CRC) or any other functional identifier that can be formulated to provide a basis for comparison of different instantiations of a resource. Farber teaches that a “True Name” of a data item (for example, files, database records and the like) obtained by computing a MD, or a hash function, is virtually guaranteed to represent the given data item and only that particular data item. Therefore, a True Name is qualified as a Descriptor and both of them are served as resource unique identifiers);

- d. a security component to determine whether the replica resource will pose a security risk to the second device upon receipt of a request for the replica resource, the security component (Farber: *inter alia*, Column 34 Line 45 – 49 and Column 43 Line 62 – 64);
- e. formulating a descriptor corresponding to the replica resource and comparing the formulated descriptor with the cached descriptor (Farber: *inter alia*, Column 31 Line 27 – 30 and Column 37 Line 36 – 42); and
- f. if the formulated descriptor and the cached descriptor are not equivalent, formulating a second descriptor corresponding to the original resource and comparing the formulated descriptor with the second descriptor (Farber: *inter alia*, Column 3 Line 35 – 38 and Column 31 Line 31 – 33: (a) Farber discloses providing Verify True File mechanism to verify that the data item in a True File registry is indeed the correct “data item” given its “True Name” (Farber: *inter alia*, Column 31 Line 26 – 33), (b) Farber defines a True Name is computed using a function, MD (Message Digest – equivalent to

Art Unit: 2131

CRC), to guarantee representing the data block and only data block (Farber: *inter alia*, Column 12 Line 38 – 43). Therefore, the “True Name” is qualified as a “Descriptor”. (c) Farber also discloses the system caches “data items” (i.e. True Name // Descriptor), so that only the most recently accessed data items need to be retained (Farber: *inter alia*, Column 3 Line 56 – 57). (d) Farber disclose data items (i.e. True Name // Descriptor) can be verified and have their integrity check to ensure that they match the stored True Names and any change in a True Name potentially signals corruption in the system and can be further investigated (Farber: *inter alia*, Column 34 Line 45 – 55). (e) Farber further discloses if an error is found (i.e. the file is corrupted), the system “has the ability to heal itself by finding another source for the True File with the given name (Farber: *inter alia*, Column 31 Line 31 – 33: This must require formulating a second descriptor (i.e. second True Name // Descriptor) corresponding to the original resource (i.e. another source that holds the original true file) so that the validation of original uncorrupted file can be conducted). Therefore, Farber indeed teaches formulating a descriptor corresponding to the replica resource and comparing the formulated descriptor with the cached descriptor (i.e. True Name of Farber’s) ", and then if the formulated descriptor and the cached descriptor are not equivalent, formulating a second descriptor corresponding to the original resource and comparing the formulated descriptor with the second descriptor" (i.e. (d) & (e) as addressed above).

9. As per claim 2, Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 1). Farber further teaches the security component determines that the replica

resource is not a security risk if the formulated descriptor and the cached descriptor are equivalent (Farber: *inter alia*, Column 37 Line 12 – 13 and Figure 28).

10. As per claim 3, Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 1). Farber further teaches if the formulated descriptor and the cached descriptor are not equivalent, and if the formulated descriptor and the second descriptor are equivalent, the security component determines that the replica resource is not a security risk (Farber: *inter alia*, Column 37 Line 13 – 14 Figure 28).

11. As per claim 4, Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 1). Farber further teaches if the formulated descriptor and the cached descriptor are not equivalent, and if the formulated descriptor and the second descriptor are equivalent, the security component determines that the replica resource is not a security risk, and the cached descriptor is replaced with the second descriptor (Farber: *inter alia*, Column 25 Line 57 – 61 and Column 37 Line 13 – 17).

12. As per claim 5, Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 1). Farber further teaches if the formulated descriptor and the cached descriptor are not equivalent, and if the formulated descriptor and the second descriptor are not equivalent, the security component determines that the replica resource is a security risk, and the replica resource is replaced with a copy of the original resource (Farber: *inter alia*, Column 37 Line 51 – 52 and Column 31 Line 31 – 32).

13. As per claim 6, Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 1). Farber further teaches if the formulated descriptor and the cached descriptor are not equivalent, and if the formulated descriptor and the second descriptor are; not

equivalent, the security component determines that the replica resource is a security risk, the replica resource is replaced with a copy of the original resource, and the cached descriptor is replaced with the second descriptor (Farber: *inter alia*, Column 37 Line 33 – 35).

14. As per claim 7, Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 1). Farber further teaches the security component formulates the cached descriptor when the original resource is replicated to create the replica resource (Farber: *inter alia*, Column 37 Line 33 – 35).

15. As per claim 8, Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 1). Farber further teaches the security component is configured to determine whether the request will pose a security risk to the second device (Farber: *inter alia*, Column 34 Line 48 – 50).

16. As per claim 20, Farber discloses a network server system comprising:

- a server component in a network server to receive a request for a resource maintained on the network server and, in response to the request, implement security policies to prevent unauthorized access to the resource (Farber: *inter alia*, Column 25 Line 26 – 28); and
- a security component in a computing device remote to the network server and registerable with the server component during run-time to determine whether the resource will pose a security risk to the network server upon receipt of the request (Farber: *inter alia*, Column 43 Line 62 – 63 and Column 34 Line 45 – 49; Farber discloses a Remote Mechanism to enable the capabilities of the present invention in a

peer-to-peer network mode of operation to access the True File registry through the Remote Procedure Call (RPC) style interface running over many available / existing protocols" (Farber: *inter alia*, Column 23 Line 14 – 44). The RPC (Remote Procedure Call) is inherently assured that the client must be registered with the server system during the run-time first before the further communications can really start).

17. As per claim 21, Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 20). Farber further teaches if the security component determines that the resource will pose a security risk, the security component redirects the request to indicate: that the resource is not available (Farber: *inter alia*, Column 25 Line 26 – 28).

18. As per claim 22, Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 20). Farber further teaches:

a. the security component: formulates a descriptor corresponding to the resource; compares the formulated descriptor with a cached descriptor, the cached descriptor corresponding to the resource and formulated when the resource is initially requested (Farber: *inter alia*, Column 31 Line 27 – 30, Column 37 Line 36 – 42, Column 14 Line 26 – 30 and Column 3 Line 56 – 57); and

b. determines that the resource is not a security risk if the formulated descriptor and the cached descriptor are equivalent (Farber: *inter alia*, Column 37 Line 12 – 13 and Figure 28).

19. As per claim 23, Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 20). Farber further teaches:

- a. formulates a descriptor corresponding to the resource; compares the formulated descriptor with a cached descriptor, the cached descriptor corresponding to the resource and formulated when the resource is initially requested (Farber: *inter alia*, Column 31 Line 27 – 30, Column 37 Line 36 – 42, and Column 14 Line 26 – 30);
- b. if the formulated descriptor and the cached descriptor are not equivalent, formulates a second descriptor corresponding to an original resource maintained on a file server remotely located from the network server, the resource being replicated from the original resource (Farber: *inter alia*, Column 3 Line 35 – 38 and Column 31 Line 31 – 33);
- c. compares the formulated descriptor with the second descriptor; and determines that the resource is not a security risk if the formulated descriptor and the second descriptor are equivalent (Farber: *inter alia*, Column 37 Line 13 – 14 and Figure 28).

20. As per claim 24, Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 20). Farber further teaches:

- a. formulates a descriptor corresponding to the resource; compares the formulated descriptor with a cached descriptor, the cached descriptor corresponding to the resource and formulated when the resource is initially requested (Farber: *inter alia*, Column 31 Line 27 – 30, Column 37 Line 36 – 42, and Column 14 Line 26 – 30);
- b. if the formulated descriptor and the cached descriptor are not equivalent, formulates a second descriptor corresponding to an original resource maintained on a file server remotely located from the network server, the resource being replicated from

the original resource (Farber: *inter alia*, Column 3 Line 35 – 38 and Column 31 Line 31 – 33);

c. compares the formulated descriptor with the second descriptor; if the formulated descriptor and the second descriptor are not equivalent, initiates that the resource stored on the network server be replaced with a copy of the original resource maintained on the file server (Farber: *inter alia*, Column 37 Line 51 – 52 and Column 31 Line 31 – 32); and

d. initiates that the cached descriptor be replaced with the second descriptor (Farber: *inter alia*, Column 37 Line 33 – 35).

21. As per claim 45, Farber discloses a method comprising:

a. receiving a request for a replica resource stored on a computing device ((Farber, see *inter alia*, Column 43 Line 58 – 62));

b. formulating a descriptor corresponding to the replica resource; comparing the formulated descriptor with a cached descriptor corresponding to an original resource stored on a second computing device remotely located from the computing device, the replica resource being replicated from the original resource (Farber, see *inter alia*, Column 31 Line 27 – 30 and Column 37 Line 36 – 42);

c. determining that the replica resource does not pose a security risk if the formulated descriptor and the cached descriptor are equivalent (Farber, see *inter alia*, Column 37 Line 12 – 13 and Figure 28);

d. if the formulated descriptor and the cached descriptor are not equivalent, formulating a second descriptor corresponding to the original resource; comparing the formulated descriptor with the second descriptor; and determining that the replica resource does not pose a security risk if the formulated descriptor and the second descriptor are equivalent (Farber, see *inter alia*, Column 37 Line 13 – 14 and Figure 28).

22. As per claim 46, Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 45). Farber further teaches allowing the request if said determining that the replica resource does not pose a security risk to the computing device (Farber, see *inter alia*, Figure 28).

23. As per claim 47, Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 45). Farber further teaches redirecting the request to indicate that the replica resource is not available if determining that the replica resource poses a security risk to the computing device (Farber, see *inter alia*, Figure 28).

24. As per claim 48, Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 45). Farber further teaches replacing the cached descriptor with the second descriptor if the formulated descriptor and the second descriptor are equivalent (Farber, see *inter alia*, Column 25 Line 57 – 61 and Column 37 Line 13 – 17).

25. As per claim 49, Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 45). Farber further teaches replacing the replica resource with a copy of the original resource if the formulated descriptor and the cached descriptor are not equivalent, and if the formulated descriptor and the second descriptor are not equivalent (Farber, see *inter alia*, Column 37 Line 51 – 52 and Column 31 Line 31 – 32).

26. As per claim 50, Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 45). Farber further teaches replacing the cached descriptor with the second descriptor if the formulated descriptor and the cached descriptor are not equivalent, and if the formulated descriptor and the second descriptor are not equivalent (Farber, see *inter alia*, Column 37 Line 33 – 35).

27. As per claim 51, Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 45). Farber further teaches formulating the cached descriptor when the original resource is replicated to create the replica resource (Farber, see *inter alia*, Column 37 Line 33 – 35).

28. As per claim 52, Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 45). Farber further teaches formulating the cached descriptor when the replica resource is initially requested (Farber, see *inter alia*, Column 14 Line 26 – 30 and Column 3 Line 56 – 57).

29. As per claim 53, Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 45). Farber further teaches determining whether the request will pose a security risk (Farber, see *inter alia*, Column 34 Line 45 – 50 and Column 31 Line 30).

30. As per claim 54, Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 45). Farber further teaches determining whether the request will pose a security risk; and redirecting the request to indicate that the replica resource is not available if determining that the request poses a security risk to the computing device (Farber, see *inter alia*, Figure 28).

31. Claim 14 – 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Brothers (Publication Number: US 2002/0083178), hereinafter referred to as Brothers.

32. As per claim 14, Brothers discloses a network server comprising:

a. a server component to receive a request for a resource maintained on the network server and, in response to the request, implement security policies to prevent unauthorized access to the resource; and a security component that is registerable with the server component during run-time to determine whether the request will pose a security risk to the network server (Brothers, see *inter alia*, Page 12 Parag. 0109 Line 10 – 13 and Figure 8: “a security risk” is interpreted as “permit an unauthorized access to the resource”. Therefore, Brother discloses validating the request for resource is authorized or not (Brother: *inter alia*, Figure 8 Element S11 and Paragraph [0109] Line 10 – 27) can indeed meet the claim language. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. Furthermore, a process / task (security component) is inherently registered with the RTOS (Real Time Operating System) in a multi-tasking operating environment when the respective process / task is invoked / initiated during the run-time after system powers up).

33. As per claim 15, Brothers teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 14). Brothers further teach if the security component determines that the request will pose a security risk, the security component redirects the request to indicate; that

the resource is not available (Brothers, see *inter alia*, Page 12 Parag. 0109 Line 17 – 21 and Figure 8).

34. As per claim 16, Brothers teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 14). Brothers further teach the request designates a resource locator having a resource path, the resource path identifying a location of the resource, and wherein the security component determines that the request is not a security risk if the resource path does not exceed a maximum number of characters (Brothers, see *inter alia*, Page 4 Parag. 0022 Line 1 – 3, Page 16 Parag. 0170 Line 6 – 9 and Figure 13B).

35. As per claim 17, Brothers teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 14). Brothers further teach the request designates a resource locator having a plurality of arguments, and wherein the security component determines that the request is not a security risk if individual arguments do not exceed a maximum number of characters, and if a total number of characters defining all of the arguments do not exceed a maximum number of characters (Brothers, see *inter alia*, Page 16 Parag. 0170 Line 6 – 9 and Figure 13B: the maximum number of characters herein is interpreted as the total number of characters aggregated from the maximum number of characters at each individual field. Therefore, the proper format checking of each individual arguments do not exceed a maximum number of characters (Brother: *inter alia*, Paragraph [0170]) is inherently validating and assuring a total number of characters defining all of the arguments do not exceed a maximum number of characters. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims).

36. As per claim 18, Brothers teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 14). Brothers further teach the request designates a resource locator having a resource identifier, and wherein the security component determines that the request is not a security risk if the resource identifier has a valid file extension (Brothers, see inter alia, Page 16 Parag. 0170 Line 9 – 10 and Figure 13B).

37. As per claim 19, Brothers teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 14). Brothers further teach:

a. the request designates a resource locator having a resource path and one or more arguments, the resource path identifying a location of the resource and the resource path having a resource identifier (Brothers, see inter alia, Page 4 Parag. 0022 Line 1 – 3);

b. the security component determines that the request is not a security risk if: the resource path does not exceed a maximum number of characters; individual arguments do not exceed a maximum number of characters; a total number of characters defining all of the arguments do not exceed a maximum number of characters; and the resource identifier has a valid file extension (Brothers, see inter alia, Page 16 Parag. 0170 and Figure 13B: the maximum number of characters herein is interpreted as the total number of characters aggregated from the maximum number of characters at each individual field. Therefore, the proper format checking of each individual arguments do not exceed a maximum number of characters (Brother: inter alia, Paragraph [0170]) is inherently validating and assuring a total number of characters defining all of the arguments do not exceed a maximum number of characters. Although the claims are

interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

38. Claim 9 – 13 and 55 – 60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farber (Patent Number: US 6415280 B1), hereinafter referred to as Farber (as applied to claim 1 and 8 above), in view of Brothers (Publication Number: US 2002/0083178), hereinafter referred to as Brothers.

39. As per claim 9, Farber teaches the claimed invention of resource integrity validation in regard to security purpose to guard against virus, malicious changes or other problems in a client-server and server-server network environment (see claim 8). Farber does not expressly teach the request designates a resource locator. Brothers further disclose the request designates a resource locator (Brothers, see *inter alia*, Page 8 Parag. 0087 Line 1 – 3).

40. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Brothers within the system of Farber because Brothers discloses the resource access in the distributed network environment through a secure universal resource locator (URL) in accordance with the emerging internet-based web applications.

41. As per claim 10, Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 8). Brothers further teach the request designates a resource locator having a resource path, the resource path identifying a location of the replica resource, and wherein the security component determines that the request is not a security risk if the resource path does not exceed a maximum number of characters (Brothers, see inter alia, Page 4 Parag. 0022 Line 1 – 3, Page 16 Parag. 0170 Line 6 – 9 and Figure 13B). Same rational for combination applies here as above in rejecting claim 9.

42. As per claim 11, Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 8). Brothers further teach the request designates a resource locator having a plurality of arguments, and wherein the security component determines that the request is not a security risk if individual arguments do not exceed a maximum number of characters, and if a total number of characters defining all of the arguments do not exceed a maximum number of characters (Brothers, see inter alia, Page 16 Parag. 0170 Line 6 – 9 and Figure 13B). Same rational for combination applies here as above in rejecting claim 9.

43. As per claim 12, Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 8). Brothers further teach the request designates a resource locator having a

resource identifier, and wherein the security component determines that the request is not a security risk if the resource identifier has a valid file extension (Brothers, see inter alia, Page 16 Parag. 0170 Line 9 – 10 and Figure 13B). Same rational for combination applies here as above in rejecting claim 9.

44. As per claim 13, Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 1). Brothers further teach:

a. the request designates a resource locator having a resource path and one or more arguments, the resource path identifying a location of the replica resource and the resource path having a resource identifier (Brothers, see inter alia, Page 4 Parag. 0022 Line 1 – 3 and Figure 2D);

b. the security component is configured to determine whether the request will pose a security risk to the second device; the security component determines that the request is not a security risk if: the resource path does not exceed a maximum number of characters; individual arguments do not exceed a maximum number of characters; a total number of characters defining all of the arguments do not exceed a maximum number of characters; and the resource identifier has a valid file extension (Brothers, see inter alia, Page 16 Parag. 0170 Line 9 – 10 and Figure 13B).

45. Same rational for combination applies here as above in rejecting claim 9.

46. As per claim 55, Farber teaches the claimed invention of resource integrity validation in regard to security purpose to guard against virus, malicious changes or other problems in a client-server and server-server network environment (see claim 45). Farber does not expressly teach uniform resource locator (URL) related subject matters.

Brothers further disclose the request designates a resource locator having a resource path, the resource path identifying a location of the replica resource, and the method further comprising determining that the request does not pose a security risk if the resource path does not exceed a maximum number of characters (Brothers, see inter alia, Page 4 Parag. 0022 Line 1 – 3, Page 16 Parag. 0170 Line 6 – 9 and Figure 13B).

47. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Brothers within the system of Farber because Brothers discloses the resource access in the distributed network environment through a secure universal resource locator (URL) in accordance with the emerging internet-based web applications.

48. As per claim 56, Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 55). Brothers further teach the request designates a resource locator having a plurality of arguments, and the method further comprising determining that the request does not pose a security risk if individual arguments do not exceed a maximum number of characters, and if a total number of characters defining all of the arguments do not exceed a maximum number of characters (Brothers, see inter alia, Page 16 Parag. 0170 Line 6 – 9 and Figure 13B). Same rational for combination applies here as above in rejecting the claim 55.

49. As per claim 57, Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 55). Brothers further teach the request designates a resource locator having a resource identifier, and the method further comprising determining that the request does not pose a security risk if the resource identifier has a valid file extension (Brothers, see

inter alia, Page 16 Parag. 0170 Line 9 – 10 and Figure 13B). Same rational for combination applies here as above in rejecting the claim 55.

50. As per claim 58, Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 55). Brothers further teach:

51. a. the request designates a resource locator having a resource path and one or more arguments, the resource path identifying a location of the replica resource and the resource path having a resource identifier (Brothers, see inter alia, Page 4 Parag. 0022 Line 1 – 3 and Figure 2D);

b. the method further comprising determining that the request does not pose a security risk if: the resource path does not exceed a maximum number of characters; individual arguments do not exceed a maximum number of characters; a total number of characters defining all of the arguments do not exceed a maximum number of characters; and the resource identifier has a valid file extension (Brothers, see inter alia, Page 16 Parag. 0170 Line 9 – 10 and Figure 13B).

52. Same rational for combination applies here as above in rejecting the claim 55.

53. As per claim 59, Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 45). The claim recites computer-readable medium comprising computer executable instructions that, when executed, direct a computing system to perform the method of claim 45. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select a computing device to serve this purpose.

54. As per claim 60, Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 58). The claim recites computer-readable medium comprising computer

executable instructions that, when executed, direct a computing system to perform the method of claim 58. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select a computing device to serve this purpose.

55. Claim 25 – 32, 37 – 44 and 61 – 70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brothers (Publication Number: US 2002/0083178), hereinafter referred to as Brothers, in view of Farber (Patent Number: US 6415280 B1), hereinafter referred to as Farber.

56. As per claim 25 and 37, Brothers teach:

- a. an Internet server to receive a request for a resource maintained on the network server and, in response to the request, implement security policies to prevent unauthorized access to the resource (Brothers, see *inter alia*, Page 12 Parag. 0109 Line 10 – 13 and Figure 8);
- b. a security component that is registerable with the Internet server during run-time, the security component having: a validation component to determine whether the request will pose a security risk to the network server by determining if a total number of characters defining all of the arguments exceeds a maximum number of characters (Brothers, see *inter alia*, Page 16 Parag. 0170: the checking of individual arguments do not exceed a maximum number of characters is inherently validating and assuring a total number of characters defining all of the arguments do not exceed a maximum number of characters, where the maximum number of characters herein is interpreted

as the total number of characters aggregated from the maximum number of characters at each individual field).

57. Brothers do not teach:

c. an integrity verification component to determine whether the resource will pose a security risk to the network server upon receipt of the request.

58. Farber teaches an integrity verification component to determine whether the resource will pose a security risk to the network server upon receipt of the request (Farber, see *inter alia*, Column 34 Line 45 – 50).

59. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Farber within the system of Brothers because Farber discloses resource integrity validation in regard to security purpose to guard against virus, malicious changes or other problems in a client-server and server-server network environment as part of emerging internet-based applications.

60. As per claims 26 and 38, Brothers-Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 25 and 37, respectively). Brothers further teach the request designates a resource locator having a resource path, the resource path identifying a location of the resource, and wherein the validation component determines that the request is not a security risk if the resource path does not exceed a maximum number of characters ((Brothers, see *inter alia*, Page 4 Parag. 0022 Line 1 – 3, Page 16 Parag. 0170 Line 6 – 9 and Figure 13B). Same rational for combination applies here as above in rejecting claim 25 and 37.

61. As per claims 27 and 39, Brothers-Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 25 and 37, respectively). Brothers further teach the request designates a resource locator having a plurality of arguments, and wherein the validation component determines that the request is not a security risk if individual arguments do not exceed a maximum number of characters (Brothers, see *inter alia*, Page 16 Parag. 0170 Line 6 – 9 and Figure 13B). Same rational for combination applies here as above in rejecting claim 25 and 37.

62. As per claims 28 and 40, Brothers-Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 25 and 37, respectively). Brothers further teach the request designates a resource locator having a resource identifier, and wherein the validation component determines that the request is not a security risk if the resource identifier has a valid file extension (Brothers, see *inter alia*, Page 16 Parag. 0170 Line 9 – 10 and Figure 13B). Same rational for combination applies here as above in rejecting claim 25 and 37.

63. As per claims 29 and 41, Brothers-Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 25 and 37, respectively). Brothers further teach:

- a. the request designates a resource locator having a resource path and one or more arguments, the resource path identifying a location of the resource and the resource path having a resource identifier (Brothers, see *inter alia*, Page 4 Parag. 0022 Line 1 – 3 and Figure 2D); and
- b. the validation component determines that the request is not a security risk if the resource path does not exceed a maximum number of characters; individual arguments

do not exceed a maximum number of characters; and the resource identifier has a valid file extension (Brothers, see *inter alia*, Page 16 Parag. 0170 and Figure 13B).

64. Same rational for combination applies here as above in rejecting the claim 25 and 37.

65. As per claims 30 and 42, Brothers-Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 25 and 37, respectively). Farber further teach:

66. a. formulates a descriptor corresponding to the resource; compares the formulated descriptor with a cached descriptor, the cached descriptor corresponding to the resource and formulated when the resource is initially requested (Farber: *inter alia*, Column 31 Line 27 – 30, Column 37 Line 36 – 42, Column 14 Line 26 – 30 and Column 3 Line 56 – 57); and

67. b. determines that the resource is not a security risk if the formulated descriptor and the cached descriptor are equivalent (Farber: *inter alia*, Column 37 Line 12 – 13 and Figure 28).

68. Same rational for combination applies here as above in rejecting the claim 25 and 37.

69. As per claims 31 and 43, Brothers-Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 25 and 37, respectively). Farber further teach:

a. formulates a descriptor corresponding to the resource; compares the formulated descriptor with a cached descriptor, the cached descriptor corresponding to the resource and formulated when the resource is initially requested (Farber: *inter alia*, Column 31 Line 27 – 30, Column 37 Line 36 – 42, and Column 14 Line 26 – 30);

b. if the formulated descriptor and the cached descriptor are not equivalent, formulates a second descriptor corresponding to an original resource maintained on a file server remotely located from the network server, the resource being replicated from the original resource (Farber: *inter alia*, Column 3 Line 35 – 38 and Column 31 Line 31 – 33);

c. compares the formulated descriptor with the second descriptor; and determines that the resource is not a security risk if the formulated descriptor and the second descriptor are equivalent (Farber: *inter alia*, Column 37 Line 13 – 14 and Figure 28).

70. Same rational for combination applies here as above in rejecting the claim 25 and 37.

71. As per claims 32 and 44, Brothers-Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 25 and 37, respectively). Farber further teach:

a. formulates a descriptor corresponding to the resource; compares the formulated descriptor with a cached descriptor, the cached descriptor corresponding to the resource and formulated when the resource is initially requested (Farber: *inter alia*, Column 31 Line 27 – 30, Column 37 Line 36 – 42, and Column 14 Line 26 – 30);

b. if the formulated descriptor and the cached descriptor are not equivalent, formulates a second descriptor corresponding to an original resource maintained on a file server remotely located from the network server, the resource being replicated from the original resource (Farber: *inter alia*, Column 3 Line 35 – 38 and Column 31 Line 31 – 33);

- c. compares the formulated descriptor with the second descriptor; if the formulated descriptor and the second descriptor are not equivalent, initiates that the resource stored on the network server be replaced with a copy of the original resource maintained on the file server (Farber: *inter alia*, Column 37 Line 51 – 52 and Column 31 Line 31 – 32); and
- d. initiates that the cached descriptor be replaced with the second descriptor (Farber: *inter alia*, Column 37 Line 33 – 35).

72. Same rational for combination applies here as above in rejecting the claim 25 and 37.

73. As per claim 61, Brothers teach:

- a. receiving a request for a resource (Brothers, see *inter alia*, Figure 2D);
- b. implementing security policies to prevent unauthorized access to the resource (Brothers, see *inter alia*, Figure 8);
- c. determining whether the request will pose a security risk by determining if a total number of characters defining all of the arguments of the request exceeds a maximum number of characters (Brothers, see *inter alia*, Page 16 Parag. 0171: the checking of individual arguments do not exceed a maximum number of characters is inherently validating and assuring a total number of characters defining all of the arguments do not exceed a maximum number of characters, where the maximum number of characters herein is interpreted as the total number of characters aggregated from the maximum number of characters at each individual field);

74. Brothers do not teach determining whether the resource will pose a security risk if allowing the request.

75. Farber teaches determining whether the resource will pose a security risk if allowing the request (Farber, see *inter alia*, Column 34 Line 45 – 50).

76. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Farber within the system of Brothers because Farber discloses resource integrity validation in regard to security purpose to guard against virus, malicious changes or other problems in a client-server and server-server network environment as part of emerging internet-based applications.

77. As per claim 62, Brothers-Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 61). The claim recites allowing the request for the resource if determining that the request does not pose a security risk and if determining that the resource does not pose a security risk. Brothers further teach the request can't be allowed if determining the request poses a security risk (Brothers, see *inter alia*, Figure 8) and subsequently Farber also teaches the access to the resource can't be allowed if determining the resource poses a security risk. This is because the True Name (i.e. unique resource ID) has been changed (Farber, see *inter alia*, Figure 28). Same rational for combination applies here as above in rejecting the claim 61.

78. As per claim 63, Brothers-Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 61). Brothers further teach the request designates a resource locator having a resource path, the resource path identifying a location of the resource, and the method further comprising determining that the request does not pose a security risk if

the resource path does not exceed a maximum number of characters (Brothers, see inter alia, Page 4 Parag. 0022 Line 1 – 3, Page 16 Parag. 0170 Line 6 – 9 and Figure 13B). Same rational for combination applies here as above in rejecting the claim 61.

79. As per claim 64, Brothers-Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 61). Brothers further teach the request designates a resource locator having a plurality of arguments, and the method further comprising determining that the request does not pose a security risk if individual arguments do not exceed a maximum number of characters (Brothers, see inter alia, Page 16 Parag. 0170 Line 6 – 9 and Figure 13B). Same rational for combination applies here as above in rejecting the claim 61.

80. As per claim 65, Brothers-Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 61). Brothers further teach the request designates a resource locator having a resource identifier, and the method further comprising determining that the request does not pose a security risk if the resource identifier has a valid file extension (Brothers, see inter alia, Page 16 Parag. 0170 Line 9 – 10 and Figure 13B). Same rational for combination applies here as above in rejecting the claim 61.

81. As per claim 66, Brothers-Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 61). Farber further teaches:

a. formulating a descriptor corresponding to the resource; comparing the formulated descriptor with a cached descriptor corresponding to the resource and formulated when the resource is initially requested (Farber: inter alia, Column 31 Line 27 – 30, Column 37 Line 36 – 42, Column 14 Line 26 – 30 and Column 3 Line 56 – 57; and

82. b. determining that the resource does not pose a security risk if the formulated descriptor and the cached descriptor are equivalent (Farber: *inter alia*, Column 37 Line 12 – 13 and Figure 28).

83. Same rational for combination applies here as above in rejecting the claim 61.

84. As per claim 67, Brothers-Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 61). Farber further teaches:

a. formulating a descriptor corresponding to the resource; comparing the formulated descriptor with a cached descriptor corresponding to the resource and formulated when the resource is initially requested (Farber: *inter alia*, Column 31 Line 27 – 30, Column 37 Line 36 – 42, and Column 14 Line 26 – 30);

b. determining that the resource does not pose a security risk if the formulated descriptor and the cached descriptor are equivalent; if the formulated descriptor and the cached descriptor are not equivalent, formulating a second descriptor corresponding to an original resource remotely located, the resource replicated from the original source (Farber: *inter alia*, Column 3 Line 35 – 38 and Column 31 Line 31 – 33);

c. comparing the formulated descriptor with the second descriptor; and determining that the resource does not pose a security risk if the formulated descriptor and the second descriptor are equivalent (Farber: *inter alia*, Column 37 Line 13 – 14 and Figure 28).

85. Same rational for combination applies here as above in rejecting the claim 61.

86. As per claim 68, Brothers-Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 61). Farber further teaches:

87. formulating a descriptor corresponding to the resource; comparing the formulated descriptor with a cached descriptor corresponding to the resource and formulated when the resource is initially requested (Farber: *inter alia*, Column 31 Line 27 – 30, Column 37 Line 36 – 42, Column 14 Line 26 – 30 and Column 3 Line 56 – 57);
- b. determining that the resource does not pose a security risk if the formulated descriptor and the cached descriptor are equivalent (Farber, see *inter alia*, Column 37 Line 12 – 13 and Figure 28);
- c. if the formulated descriptor and the cached descriptor are not equivalent, formulating a second descriptor corresponding to an original resource remotely located, the resource replicated from the original resource (Farber, see *inter alia*, Column 3 Line 35 – 38 and Column 31 Line 31 – 33);
- d. comparing the formulated descriptor with the second descriptor; and determining that the resource does not pose a security risk if the formulated descriptor and the second descriptor are equivalent (Farber, see *inter alia*, Column 37 Line 13 – 14 and Figure 28);
- e. if the formulated descriptor and the second descriptor are not equivalent, replacing the resource with a copy of the original resource and replacing the cached descriptor with the second descriptor (Farber, see *inter alia*, Column 37 Line 51 – 52, Column 31 Line 31 – 32 and Column 37 Line 33 – 35).
88. Same rational for combination applies here as above in rejecting the claim 61.
89. As per claim 69, Brothers-Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 61). The claim recites computer-readable medium comprising

computer executable instructions that, when executed, direct a computing system to perform the method of claim 61. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select a computing device to serve this purpose.

90. As per claim 70, Brothers-Farber teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 68). The claim recites computer-readable medium comprising computer executable instructions that, when executed, direct a computing system to perform the method of claim 68. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select a computing device to serve this purpose.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2131

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Longbit Chai whose telephone number is 571-272-3788. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00am-4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz R Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Longbit Chai
Examiner
Art Unit 2131

LBC
LBC

Gilberto Barron Jr.
GILBERTO BARRON JR.
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100